

Russell Group response to the Adrian Smith review

1. Summary

- The UK's success as a knowledge economy hinges on our ability to collaborate on research and innovation with the best minds in Europe and across the world.
- We welcome this review as an opportunity to support the UK Government in setting out a positive vision for enhancing the UK's international research performance in the long term, including through maintaining as close as possible links with Europe, as well as exploring ways to provide greater support for wider international collaboration.
- Following extensive discussion with Russell Group universities about the mechanisms to support collaboration with European partners, it is our view that associating to the EU's Horizon Europe programme after Brexit offers the best opportunities for enhancing the excellence, breadth and strength of the UK's research base, attracting top quality academics from across the globe and ensuring the UK is at the forefront of major scientific breakthroughs.
- However, if the UK's association to Horizon Europe or future Framework Programmes is not possible, there needs to be a fully funded alternative which can replicate the benefits we derive from EU Framework Programmes as closely as possible. A key priority must be to provide stability to the UK research base and community in any transition from being one of the core participants of Horizon 2020 to operating outside of these frameworks. This will be essential given the importance of R&D as a key driver of economic growth and a central pillar of the Government's Industrial Strategy.
- Any plans for domestic alternative schemes should not be assessed in isolation but compared with what we would expect to gain from association to Horizon Europe, taking the non-monetary benefits into account.
- To complement existing ODA research funds, there is an opportunity for the Government to enhance support for wider international research collaboration by providing funding for projects that extend beyond the problems of developing nations and where the partners are not on the DAC list of low- and middle-income countries. Consideration could be given to setting up a new fund for global research collaboration which would aim to facilitate cooperation between UKRI and other international research funding bodies and with the ability to foster multi-lateral international collaboration.
- An ambitious vision for international research collaboration must consider the benefits of regulatory alignment (for example on clinical trials) and be underpinned by an immigration system which supports universities and research organisations to attract and retain students, academics and technical experts from anywhere in the world.

2. The value of international collaboration

- 2.1 Research and innovation are global pursuits and are most effective when ideas and people are mobile across borders. Mobility of talent and large-scale global networks contribute to the competitiveness of our leading universities and the UK economy.
- 2.2 Our success as a knowledge economy hinges on our ability to collaborate with the best minds in Europe and across the world. The scientific landscape has grown ever more international and many of today's challenges are global, from tackling climate change to fighting cancer and developing new energy sources. There is growing recognition that these require a critical mass of excellent research and diverse minds to solve them. International

cooperation is becoming more prevalent and more important: while around 90% of UK research output was domestic in 1981, less than half is now produced domestically.¹

- 2.3 UK researchers collaborate most frequently with the EU27 taken as a group. Between 2015 and 2017, the UK published 162,000 papers in collaboration with academics across the EU, nearly double the number resulting from collaborations with the USA (88,500).²
- 2.4 International research has been shown to be more impactful and for Russell Group universities this is certainly the case: average Field-Weighted Citation Impact for Russell Group university publications with an international co-author is 2.6, compared to 1.7 with a national co-author and 1.4 with a co-author based in the same institution.³ Indeed, global cooperation in research can bring a range of benefits, including access to complementary expertise, knowledge and skills; access to unique sites, facilities or population groups; sharing costs and risks; and establishing standards (especially within industrial collaborations).⁴
- 2.5 The UK is a world-leader in research and innovation, with established links across the globe, but we cannot take our position for granted. We welcome this review as an opportunity to support the Government in setting out a positive vision for enhancing the UK's international research performance in the long term, including through maintaining as close as possible links with Europe, as well as providing greater support for wider international collaboration. Evidence suggests that multinational companies' decisions to invest in a country are linked to the quality of a nation's science base.⁵ Protecting and enhancing the UK's research base as a priority post-Brexit will therefore deliver longer-term economic and social benefits for the UK overall and support the Government in achieving its Industrial Strategy aims, including the target to boost R&D investment to 2.4% of GDP by 2027.

3. The value of EU Framework Programmes

- 3.1 Following extensive discussion with Russell Group universities about the mechanisms to support collaboration with European partners, it is our view that associating to the EU's Horizon Europe programme after Brexit offers the best opportunities for enhancing the excellence, breadth and strength of the UK's research base, attracting top quality academics from across the globe and ensuring the UK is at the forefront of major scientific breakthroughs. It has been shown that:
 - For papers published by UK-only authors and UK-EU co-authored papers, those acknowledging any type of EU funding have more impact than the average; and where that funding came from the ERC, papers have the highest impact of all.⁶
 - The ERC has the highest category normalised citation impact, the highest percentage of papers in the world's top 1% and the highest percentage of papers involving international co-authorship of the top 50 funders.⁷
- 3.2 EU Framework Programmes support world-class research and deliver significant added value which extends far beyond the funding. Assessing the "value for money" of EU Framework Programmes is challenging, and value should be viewed in its entirety, not judged on a purely financial return. We have outlined below some of the key characteristics

¹ 'International research collaboration after the UK leaves the European Union' - Digital Science Consultancy for UUK (April 2017).

² SciVal platform accessed September 2018. Analysis includes co-authored publications with UK institutions between 2015-2017.

³ SciVal platform accessed September 2018. Analysis included all publications between 2015-2017 and was not weighted by institution.

⁴ L. Georghiou, 'Global Cooperation in Research', *Research Policy* 27 (1998).

⁵ J. Haskel *et al.*, 'The Economic Significance of the UK Science Base' - A report for The Campaign for Science and Engineering (March 2014).

⁶ Royal Society: 'UK research and the European Union - The role of the EU in international research collaboration and researcher mobility' (May 2016)

⁷ 'The European Research Council The first 10 years (2017)' – a report by Clarivate Analytics.

of EU Framework Programmes which bring a unique added value and which we believe could not be easily replicated through domestic schemes (especially on a short timescale):

- **Excellence through maximising competition** – the scale of competition for EU research funding allocated on the basis excellence drives up the quality of research across a wide range of disciplines, especially through prestigious ERC grants.
- **Ease of multi-lateral, cross-border collaboration** – a common framework, rules and funding cycle makes near-frictionless collaboration possible with the best partners across the EU and beyond. A central application and evaluation system particularly helps avoid issues around double jeopardy.
- **Tackling global challenges at scale** – large projects are funded which could not feasibly take place on a national level, even with increased budgets, due to their scale. The introduction of Missions in Horizon Europe will take this concept one step further.
- **Attracting and nurturing top talent** – the world’s best researchers are attracted to our universities because they can access the Framework Programmes and especially as they can host ERC grants and coordinate European projects. The ERC supports the whole researcher career lifecycle with its structure of grant types from starting to consolidator to advanced, and the MSCA offers valuable opportunities for early-career researchers.
- **Networks** – the EU framework facilitates the building of networks and relationships which often form the basis of much longer-term collaboration between multiple different institutions and nations around the world.
- **Large-scale research infrastructures, equipment and data** – the EU invests in key pieces of research infrastructure from which UK researchers can benefit. Being able to share and combine resources, equipment and datasets with ease makes UK research more efficient and effective.
- **Regulatory alignment** - EU Framework programmes can shape research standards and regulation. For example, a collaboration funded by the EU is creating a Code of Conduct for Health Research on how to apply the GDPR in practice.⁸ The UK has played a key role in influencing the development of EU legislation to support research collaboration e.g. the new EU Clinical Trials Regulation, which allows for a coordinated approach to trial approval and data storage, potentially offering savings of £60 million a year to UK researchers.⁹
- **Industry participation** – UK private companies, from SMEs to large corporations, gain from the ability to form multinational consortia, which support key parts of the UK economy. The EU Framework Programmes also support UK universities’ interactions with industries which may not be present in the UK and allow us to help shape related EU regulation around new technologies etc. Joint initiatives such as Clean Sky support major university-business collaboration at significant scale and enhance industry expertise and investment in the UK.
- **Complementarity to other parts of the UK system** – EU Framework Programmes are an essential part of the research and innovation ecosystem, sustaining a wide range of disciplines, supporting an even broader research base in the UK and offering a wider diversity of funding sources.

3.3 Continued UK participation in EU programmes also strengthens overall European excellence in science more broadly, which is increasingly important in a globally competitive

⁸ <http://code-of-conduct-for-health-research.eu>

⁹ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/brexit-and-beyond-clinical-trials.pdf>

environment, where the UK alone is not of sufficient size and scale to compete with the USA, China and others.

- 3.4 Our ability to access EU research programmes, and particularly the ERC, helps UK universities to attract and retain world-leading scholars from across Europe. The quality of EU research staff is evident in that 75% of EU academics were selected by UK universities for REF 2014, compared to 56% of UK-national staff.¹⁰ Leading international researchers help to enhance the excellence and reputation of research in their departments, which in turn attracts top students to study at UK universities, so there are other knock-on impacts of our links to EU programmes which underpin the UK's world-class higher education system. These benefits are not only felt within the sector, but have economic implications for the whole country given that "the UK's outstanding university sector should be a strong attractor for overseas funding of R&D in the private sector and the location of R&D activity in the UK."¹¹
- 3.5 Although not captured within the direct scope of this review, it is important to note the role of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) in supporting R&D in the UK. It is estimated that €40.2 billion of structural funds will be allocated to research and innovation activities over the period 2014 – 2020, which contribute to the construction of research infrastructure and support for technology transfer and research-intensive businesses.¹² The Government should consider carefully how the proposed new Shared Prosperity Fund can continue to support R&I effectively to boost regional growth.

4. The Discovery Fund

- 4.1 If the UK's association to Horizon Europe or future Framework Programmes is not possible, there needs to be a fully funded alternative in place to minimise disruption and provide some stability – this is especially important if we are to retain and continue to attract talented researchers here. Whilst the UK could continue to participate in some parts of Horizon Europe as a third country (see Section 5 below for more details on this), UK researchers would be locked out of mono-beneficiary elements, including the ERC and MSCA. These schemes are globally renowned and the UK should seek to learn from the good practice they exemplify by replicating some of their core features through a new Discovery Fund. Particularly in the short term this would help to mitigate some of the disruption that would be caused by non-association. The Government could review the efficacy and impact of the Discovery Fund over time and in the longer term continue to evaluate if the scheme is the best way in which to support and enhance the UK science base.
- 4.2 Plans for domestic alternative schemes should not be assessed in isolation but compared with what we would expect to gain from association to Horizon Europe, taking the non-monetary benefits into account. However, in our view it will not be possible to replicate all the benefits in full on a domestic level.

Scale and funding

- 4.3 The UK has been the most successful country in securing ERC grants, winning 23% of all grants from 2007 to 2018. Evidence suggests the ERC provides significant impact:
- The latest independent study on the output of frontier research funded by the ERC shows that 79% of projects were of major impact; 19% led to a breakthrough and 60% to a major scientific advance. Almost half of the projects have already left their mark on

¹⁰ 'Selection of staff for inclusion in the REF 2014', HEFCE (August 2015).

¹¹ J. Haskel *et al.*, 'The Economic Significance of the UK Science Base' (2014).

¹² Royal Society: 'UK research and the European Union - The role of the EU in international research collaboration and researcher mobility' (May 2016)

the economy, society and policymaking, whilst around three quarters are foreseen to do so on the medium and long term.¹³

- 4.4 With this in mind, the Discovery Fund should be ambitious and seek to deliver funding at least equal to what we would expect UK to win from the mono-beneficiary parts of Horizon Europe. This should consider the higher budget for the next programme compared to Horizon 2020. To remain competitive with the EU and to continue to attract researchers to the UK, grants should match the level of funding for individual awards of both ERC and MSCA schemes (e.g. ERC awards are €1.5 million to €2 million) and the length of funding (typically five years). A longer duration of Discovery Fund grants will particularly help to encourage international researchers who come to the UK for these awards to become more embedded here and therefore more likely to stay and continue their careers in the UK rather than returning home once the grant period concludes. The Universities and Sciences Minister has recently highlighted the importance of retaining international talent to cement the UK's success in R&D and to meet the 2.4% GDP investment target.¹⁴
- 4.5 To the greatest extent possible in a UK context, the Government should seek to guarantee longer-term stability of funding through the Discovery Fund with five- to seven-year cycles, so that it is not subject to annual budget reviews and researchers can prepare high-quality bids in advance with confidence.

Prestige

- 4.6 Creating a new fund with the prestige of the ERC and MSCA will be challenge, particularly in the short term. As a core priority, scientific excellence should to be the main selection criterion, encouraging high-quality, bottom-up research through competitive funding.
- 4.7 Currently around 50% of ERC grantees based in the UK are of non-UK nationality. To create a strong global reputation and continue to attract the best researchers from anywhere in the world, the Discovery Fund should be open to researchers of any nationality based in a UK institution.
- 4.8 The prestige of ERC-funded research is derived from high-quality international peer review, with the best researchers being chosen by similarly excellent renowned experts. The UK should invest in ensuring the peer review process is as international and robust as possible, attracting top evaluators from around the world. The ERC process is more costly than domestic processes as it convenes reviewers in Brussels to discuss proposals; however, it is highly effective and draws on a pool of over 30,000 experts from more than 34 countries.
- 4.9 Incentives need to be designed to recruit evaluators; setting up a scheme primarily focussed on excellence is a good starting point. There may be a role for universities and learned academies to help the Government design a peer review system and attract high-quality reviewers. The UK could also look to other examples of international good practice, such as the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Partnership Grants, which operates peer review panels made up of Canadian and international scholars.¹⁵

Disciplinary balance

- 4.10 There is a high degree of variation in the source of research grant income and reliance on EU funding across disciplines at UK universities. HESA data shows that arts, humanities and social sciences research generally receive a higher proportion of funding from the EU

¹³ 'Qualitative Evaluation of completed projects funded by the European Research Council (2017)' (May 2018). https://erc.europa.eu/news/impact_study_breakthroughs_major_advances

¹⁴ Chris Skidmore MP speech 'Reaching 2.4%: Securing the research talent of tomorrow' (7 May 2019).

¹⁵ http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/merit_review-evaluation_du_merite/index-eng.aspx

compared with the natural and physical sciences. EU funding accounts for 35% of research income in classics, 33% in archaeology and 28% in philosophy, compared with 6% in clinical medicine and 10% in biosciences.¹⁶ Whilst the absolute values of research income from the EU are typically smaller in these subjects, its relative importance means that these areas may be amongst the most at risk from any change in access to EU funding in the future.

- 4.11 The ERC is of particularly vital importance to the social sciences and humanities (SSH) in UK universities, as it represents one of the only opportunities in Europe for ground-breaking, high-risk SSH research. Around 25% of the overall ERC funding is allocated to SSH. This is well above the usual levels in research programmes; in the UK, the budgets for AHRC and ESRC amount to around 10% of the total budget of the seven Research Councils. For institutions specialising in SSH, the EU can be the single most important funder of research grants and the UK has been especially successful in winning ERC SSH funds.
- 4.12 The Discovery Fund should therefore cover the full range of disciplines and should look to ensure that a similar level of support as offered by the ERC is provided across the broad discipline areas (life sciences; physical sciences and engineering; and social sciences and humanities). As with the ERC, the Discovery Fund should not be prescriptive about which specific disciplines are supported, ensuring openness to the very best quality proposals from all subject areas, including interdisciplinary work. Indeed, the ERC is particularly successful in facilitating interdisciplinary research, which enhances its quality and impact and the UK should seek to learn from this approach.¹⁷ The balance of funding for different disciplines should be monitored over time.

MSCA replacement

- 4.13 Individual fellowships under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA) play a crucial part in attracting early-career talent to the UK and forming lasting, international collaborations. The MSCA Innovative Training Networks (ITNs) are also highly valued by Russell Group universities. New funding arrangements should facilitate training and mobility for researchers at all stages of their career as a replacement for MSCA. Such a scheme should support both the UK to host talented overseas researchers and for the mobility of UK researchers for fellowships overseas. There is an opportunity in designing a new scheme to make it more global in focus by ensuring it is open to talented researchers from all over the world.

Delivery and governance of the Discovery Fund

- 4.14 The Discovery Fund must have a high degree of independence from Government so that is not driven by political priorities. It is vital that calls should be designed in a bottom-up manner, rather than aligning with particular themes or priorities set by UKRI or the UK Government. As far as possible, the governance of the Discovery Fund should try to emulate the model of the ERC's independent Scientific Council, comprising world-leading experts from many different countries. In this regard, simply embedding the fund within the existing UKRI structures would not be sufficient and a new solution would be needed to ensure independence and to ring-fence funds from other parts of the UK science budget.
- 4.15 Maintaining a high degree of independence is not to say purely bottom-up research would not support key government priorities. For example, the ERC is funding a range of research which aligns directly with the Grand Challenges of the UK's industrial strategy, from developments in producing liquid batteries to refuel electric cars in minutes (a key element of the Future of Mobility Grand Challenge), to understanding, exploiting and managing the

¹⁶ Russell Group analysis of HESA Finance data 2017/18.

¹⁷ Around 70% of ERC projects have created innovative interactions across domains: 'Qualitative Evaluation of completed projects funded by the European Research Council (2017)' (May 2018).

paradigm shift that is under way in 'big data' and artificial intelligence.¹⁸ Bottom-up, blue skies research complements a challenge-based approach to research funding by ensuring there is a sustainable pipeline of new ideas to underpin innovation in areas which may not yet have emerged as the global challenges of the future.

Timescales and contingencies

- 4.16 The ERC's global reputation for excellence and proven delivery of impact has taken years to establish. Building the Discovery Fund to a similar standing would need plenty of lead-in time to establish the fund, design calls and set up a high-quality international peer review system.
- 4.17 The challenge for the UK is that negotiations with the European Commission on the costs and terms of our association cannot be discussed formally until the regulations have been adopted. This means there could potentially be a very small window of time during which the Government has to decide either to associate or to set up alternative schemes. Even if the Government does pursue association to Horizon Europe, contingency planning will be required to protect and stabilise the research system if there is a hiatus before association is finalised.
- 4.18 Whatever the Government's decision with regards to association, it is clear that any gap in support for curiosity-driven research could risk serious damage to the UK's attractiveness which could take many years to recover from. It would therefore be prudent to have plans in place for how any new funding arrangements could be set up quickly if we do not associate, recognising that these plans may not be needed. In addition, we would welcome a strong signal from Government about its likely intentions to negotiate association to Horizon Europe so that UK-based researchers can begin to prepare for the start of the programme and lay the groundwork to ensure strong UK participation from the beginning.

5. International collaboration

Third country access to European Framework Programmes

- 5.1 Without association to Horizon Europe or future programmes, funding should be provided for UK researchers to access these programmes on a third country basis. It will be important to avoid double jeopardy for funding approval. UK researchers will need strong reassurances that they will receive Government funding for their contribution if they participate in EU consortia. This is not only important to minimise burden on researchers and bureaucracy, but to give international partners the confidence to work with UK-based researchers and include them in consortia.
- 5.2 If the Government were to restrict which calls UK-based researchers could apply for in any way this would need to be considered carefully so that it is very well communicated to the research community. If decisions are to be made about which calls/topics the UK Government would be willing to support, these should be made in consultation with the community and be based on rigorous scientific scrutiny and strategic oversight. However, an overly-restrictive approach, especially at the start of the programme, could undermine confidence among UK researchers and their partners in the EU and discourage them from participating, which would not be helpful.
- 5.3 There is a risk that the UK's transition from a full participant in Horizon 2020 to a third country in Horizon Europe could make it difficult to maintain a strong level of participation. Even

¹⁸ Examples drawn from University of Glasgow and University of Bristol ERC grants respectively: <https://erc.europa.eu/projects-figures/stories/tenfold-improvement-liquid-batteries-mean-electric-car-refuelling-could> and <https://thinkbig.enm.bris.ac.uk/> Indeed, given the volume and quality of AI work supported by the ERC, they hosted a specific conference on the topic in October last year.

without restrictions placed on eligible calls, such a transition could lead to a lack of confidence from partner organisations in the UK's ability to join consortia and lead projects. This was the experience of Swiss researchers when, in 2014, Switzerland was temporarily classified as a third country in Horizon 2020. Despite the regulations allowing third countries to coordinate projects, the Swiss project coordination rate dropped from 3.9% in FP7 to 0.3% in the first two years of Horizon 2020 (2014 and 2015). Overall participation also dropped from 3.2% in Horizon 2020 to 1.8% in the first two years of Horizon 2020.¹⁹

- 5.4 Whereas association to the programme would allow the UK to continue to be represented on programme committees (albeit as an observer without voting rights), as a third country we would cut out of these decision-making processes, limiting our influence over the direction of the programme.

A new international research fund

- 5.5 There is a gap in the UK's research funding landscape for large-scale non-Official Development Assistance (ODA) international collaborative research programmes, for example with other leading global research nations such as China, the USA, Australia and Canada. Because there are limited established funding mechanisms for such projects, those collaborations that do succeed are often smaller in scale, tend to be the result of organic academic-to-academic relationships and are frequently funded by QR research funding.
- 5.6 Currently the main schemes for supporting international collaboration, the Newton Fund and the Global Challenges Research Fund, are funded from the UK's ODA budget and are targeted at working with low- and middle-income countries for research into the problems of developing countries. To complement these funds, there is an opportunity for the Government to enhance support for wider international research collaboration in a broader range of issues and with non-ODA countries.
- 5.7 To drive forward the UK's international collaboration post-Brexit, a new fund for international research collaboration could facilitate collaboration between UKRI and research funding bodies internationally, fostering frictionless (or as near frictionless as possible) multi-lateral international collaboration. We believe it would be preferable to set up a new fund rather than putting additional resources into existing schemes, as currently Research Councils rarely fund across more than two borders and although they fund project costs, they do not tend to cover other costs e.g. travel.
- 5.8 UKRI could be responsible for strategically identifying key partner countries/organisations it would be in the UK's interests to work with and seek to form partnership agreements. Consideration will need to be given to *how* to prioritise international R&I support, for example focusing on particular countries or regions, or prioritising strategic research areas.
- 5.9 The EU R&I programme's common framework for application and evaluation has been central to facilitating collaboration. Universities have experienced significant difficulty in establishing multilateral programmes with international funding agencies outside the EU. One common challenge to creating a truly joint international programme is the issue of double assessment.
- 5.10 In expanding research collaboration with global partners, reciprocal arrangements based on trust of partners' evaluation processes, or joint peer review panels, would need to be established to streamline this process. Some examples of where double jeopardy issues have been avoided include the Humanities in the European Research Area (HERA), which

¹⁹ Data provided by swissuniversities.

brings together 26 humanities research councils²⁰, and the Open Research Area (ORA) which operates jointly from the ESRC and three other European research councils. UKRI could usefully explore different models for cooperation and see what lessons could be learned.

- 5.11 Government should be mindful that countries the UK might prioritise as international collaborators may not have mutual motivation or political ambition to work with the UK. This could be especially true for EU countries if they are already participating in Horizon Europe through their EU budget contributions. Even with willingness, there could also be challenges in aligning funding cycles and setting up joint funding structures. It is therefore important that any new UK international research fund is significantly attractive in size and operation that it offers a unique opportunity to global partners and incentivises them to partner with the UK.
- 5.12 In the longer term, we are unlikely to meet the target to invest 2.4% of our GDP on R&I unless there is significant inwards investment in R&D from overseas companies, so the Government could use a new fund for international research to support partnerships with overseas businesses. Establishing incentives as part of a new scheme to attract international businesses to work with excellent UK research partners would be beneficial. Investment in doctoral training, for example, with in-built international and industry collaboration, would help the UK meet its ambition of training more researchers and could attract co-investment from industry.

6. Attractiveness to international researchers

- 6.1 International talent underpins excellence in education, research and innovation. This excellence drives the UK's position as a world-leading research nation and is helping secure a skilled and effective future UK workforce. Attracting talented researchers from overseas in turn boosts UK research quality.
- 6.2 An ambitious vision for international research collaboration must be underpinned by an immigration system which supports universities and research organisations to attract and retain students, academics and technical experts from anywhere in the world. A key aspect of this is the ability for researchers to bring their families and lab teams if needed.
- 6.3 The Russell Group has developed detailed work on priorities for a future skills-based immigration system post-Brexit which can support the UK research base. Features of such a system include that any salary threshold for the skilled visa route should be no more than £21,000; to explore options that support flexible mobility through the UK-EU Mobility Framework; to implement at least two years' post-study work leave; ambitious reform of sponsorship and investment in IT infrastructure to streamline processes; proportionate visa charges; and an overall consistent message of welcome to overseas talent.
- 6.4 Alongside more holistic reforms of the immigration system, consideration could also be given to expanding the Tier 1 Exceptional Talent visa to support talent at all levels and to ensure that recipients of Horizon Europe funding (in the case of association) or Discovery Fund grants and funding provided through any new international collaboration funds (in the case of no association) are eligible for accelerated endorsement under this visa route to make the UK as attractive as possible to talented international researchers.

²⁰ <http://heranet.info/about-us/>